

REMARKS

Claims 1-28 stand rejected. Claims 1-28 remain pending in this patent application. Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration in view of the remarks set forth below. Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments to the specification and claims do not add new matter to the application.

Statement of Common Ownership

The Examiner is respectfully directed to MPEP 706.02(l)(1) and MPEP 706.02(l)(2).

The instant patent application Serial No. 09/534,832 and the cited prior art reference U.S. Patent No. 6,147,714 (Terasawa et al.) were, at the time the invention of the instant patent application was made, subject to an obligation of assignment to the same assignee.

35 U.S.C. §102 and 103 Rejections

Claims 1-6, 8-19 and 21-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Terasawa et al., US Patent Number 6,147,714 (hereinafter Terasawa). Claims 7 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Terasawa in view of Sawada et al., US Patent Number 6,476,821 (hereinafter Sawada).

Claims 1, 14 and 27

Applicants have herein amended independent Claims 1 and 14 to include the subject matter of Claims 7 and 20, respectively. Furthermore, Applicants have herein amended independent Claim 27 to include subject matter similar to Claim 7. Accordingly, the present Office Action alleges that Claims 1, 14 and 27 as amended are obvious, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), by the combination of Terasawa and Sawada.

Applicants respectfully submit that Terasawa is disqualified as prior art for purposes of 35 U.S.C. §103. The instant application and the Terasawa patent were, at the time the invention of the instant application was made, subject to an obligation of assignment to the same assignee.

Applicants respectfully contend that Sawada does not teach or suggest the present invention as recited in amended independent Claims 1, 14 and 27. Based on the above rationale, Applicants respectfully submit that newly amended independent Claims 1, 14 and 27 are not rendered obvious by Sawada. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit amended Claims 1, 14 and 27 are allowable over Sawada.

Claims 5-7 and 18-20

As mentioned above, Applicants respectfully submit that Terasawa is disqualified as prior art. Applicants respectfully assert that the subject matter of dependent Claims 5-7 and 18-20 of the present application are not rendered obvious by Sawada based on the same rationale discussed above for amended independent

Claims 1 and 14 from which Claims 5-7 and 18-20 depend. Moreover, Applicants respectfully contend that Sawada does not teach or suggest an input provided by a display device or input device that includes aspect ratio data, screen size, or a resolution of the display device as recited in dependent Claims 5-7 and 18-20. For instance, Claim 5 recites (emphasis added):

The method recited in Claim 4 wherein said display characteristic includes aspect ratio data regarding said display device.

Based on the above rationale, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent Claims 5-7 and 18-20 are not rendered obvious by Sawada. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit Claims 5-7 and 18-20 are allowable over Sawada.

Claims 12 and 25

As mentioned above, Applicants respectfully submit that Terasawa is disqualified as prior art. Applicants respectfully assert that the subject matter of dependent Claims 12 and 25 of the present application are not rendered obvious by Sawada based on the same rationale discussed above for amended independent Claims 1 and 14 from which Claims 12 and 25 depend. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully contend that Sawada does not teach or suggest comparing an input regarding an appearance of a display device to a predetermined threshold value as recited in dependent Claims 12 and 25. For instance, Claim 12 recites in part (emphasis added):

f) comparing said input to a predetermined threshold value.

Based on the above rationale, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent Claims 12 and 25 are not rendered obvious by Sawada. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit Claims 12 and 25 are allowable over Sawada.

Claims 13 and 26

As mentioned above, Applicants respectfully submit that Terasawa is disqualified as prior art. Applicants respectfully assert that the subject matter of dependent Claims 13 and 26 of the present application are not rendered obvious by Sawada based on the same rationale discussed above for amended independent Claims 1 and 14 from which Claims 13 and 26 depend. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully contend that Sawada does not teach or suggest selecting a specific portion of said block of text-based data based on aspect ratio, resolution, and screen size of a class of display devices, provided an input regarding an appearance of a display device is not received, as recited in dependent Claims 13 and 26. For instance, Claim 13 recites in part (emphasis added):

f) selecting a specific portion of said block of text-based data based on a default value for aspect ratio, resolution, and screen size of a class of display devices, provided said input is not received;

Based on the above rationale, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent Claims 13 and 26 are not rendered obvious by Sawada. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit Claims 13 and 26 are allowable over Sawada.

Claims 16 and 28

As mentioned above, Applicants respectfully submit that Terasawa is disqualified as prior art. Applicants respectfully assert that the subject matter of dependent Claims 16 and 28 of the present application are not rendered obvious by Sawada based on the same rationale discussed above for amended independent Claims 1 and 14 from which Claims 16 and 28 depend. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully contend that Sawada does not teach or suggest implementing vertical compression as recited in dependent Claims 16 and 28. For instance, Claim 16 recites in part (emphasis added):

f) implementing vertical compression of said block of text-based data with a first aspect ratio for display on said display device having a second aspect ratio.

Based on the above rationale, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent Claims 16 and 28 are not rendered obvious by Sawada. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit Claims 16 and 28 are allowable over Sawada.

Claims 2-4, 8-11, 15, 17 and 21-24

As mentioned above, Applicants respectfully submit that Terasawa is disqualified as prior art. Applicants respectfully assert that the subject matter of dependent Claims 2-4, 8-12, 15, 17 and 21-25 of the present application are not rendered obvious by Sawada based on the same rationale discussed above for amended independent Claims 1 and 14 from which Claims 2-4, 8-12, 15, 17 and 21-25 depend. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 2-4, 8-12, 15, 17 and 21-25 are allowable over Sawada.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above listed amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of rejected Claims 1-28.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP



Dated: Dec. 16, 2003

Thomas M. Catale
Registration No.: 46,434

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP
Two North Market Street, Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113

Voice: (408) 938-9060
Facsimile: (408) 938-9069